Amendment/Response dated April 9, 2007

Response to Office action dated February 6, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant would like to acknowledge, with thanks, the Office Action that was mailed on February 6, 2007. Accordingly, this amendment is responsive to the February 6, 2007 Office Action. Reconsideration of the application as now amended is now requested for the reasons set forth below.

Independent clams 1, 10 and dependent claims 2-5, 11-13 and 16 have been amended; claims 24-25 have been added; and claims 8-9 and 17 have been canceled. The elements that the first and second master switch wireless modules broadcast connection signals and the selection by the first and second slave switch wireless modules is not new matter as it is described in Fig. 3 of the original specification. The element in claim 10 that the second slave switch wireless module selects the second connection signal responsive to determining the first master switch wireless module is bound to the first slave switch wireless module is not new matter as it is disclosed on page 11 lines 19-23 of the original specification. The element in claim 10 that the data representative of the first master switch wireless module is added to a prohibited list is not new matter as it is disclosed in the original specification (see ref. char. 385 in Fig. 3). New claims 24-25 do not contain new matter as the recited subject matter is disclosed on page 7, lines 23-24 of the original specification.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-6, 10-14, 18, 21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0123011 to Murayama et al. (hereinafter Murayama), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0061533 to Perloff et al. (hereinafter Perloff) and U.S. Patent No. 6,452,910 to Vij et al. (hereinafter Vij). For reasons that will now be set forth, these claims are not obvious in view of Murayama, Perloff and/or Vij, when taken alone or in any combination thereof.

Claim 1 as currently amended recites a system for wireless bridging between networks.

The system comprises a master switch, the master switch including first and second master switch wireless modules, the first master switch wireless module including means for selectively broadcasting a first associated connection signal and the second master switch wireless module

Amendment/Response dated April 9, 2007

Response to Office action dated February 6, 2007

including means for selectively broadcasting a second associated connection signal. A master switch aggregation port is associated with the master switch, the master switch aggregation port being in data communication with each of the first and second master switch wireless modules. The master switch aggregation port including means for selectively routing data among the first and second master switch wireless modules. The system further comprises a slave switch that includes an associated first and second slave switch wireless modules. The first slave switch wireless module including means for receiving the first associated connection signal and means for establishing a first wireless data communication link with the first master switch broadcasting the first associated connection signal after receipt thereof. The second slave switch wireless module including means for receiving the second associated connection signal and means for establishing a second wireless data communication link with the second master switch broadcasting the second associated connection signal after receipt thereof. A lave switch aggregation port is associated with the slave switch. The slave switch aggregation port being in data communication with each of the first and second slave switch wireless modules, the slave switch aggregation port including means for selectively routing data among the first and slave switch wireless modules. The first wireless data communication link and the second wireless data communications link operate concurrently.

Independent claim 10 recites a method of wireless bridging between networks. The method comprises the steps of selectively routing data among a first and second master switch wireless modules, associated with a master switch, via a switch aggregation port associated therewith. A first connection signal is selectively broadcast from the first master switch wireless modules. A second connection signal is selectively broadcast from the second master switch wireless module. The first connection signal and the second connection signal are received by a first slave switch wireless modules associated with a slave switch. The first connection signal is selected for establishing a first wireless data communication link between the first master switch wireless modules broadcasting the first connection signal and the first slave switch wireless modules after receipt of the connection signals. Data representative of the first master switch wireless module is added to a prohibited list responsive to establishing the first wireless data communication link. The first connection signal and the second connection signal are also received by a second slave switch wireless module associated with the slave switch. The second

Amendment/Response dated April 9, 2007

Response to Office action dated February 6, 2007

connection signal is selected by the second slave switch wireless module responsive to determining the first master switch wireless module is bound to the first slave switch wireless module. Data is selectively routed among the first and second wireless communication links via a slave switch aggregation port associated therewith.

By contrast, Murayama describes a bus that is provided with a switch having a plurality of master ports and a plurality of slave ports that can connect each of the plurality of master ports to an arbitrary port of the plurality of slave ports (Abstract; cf. Fig. 6). Murayama discloses that each master module in the system must access a plurality of slave modules (¶ 5). Murayama does not teach or suggest first and second wireless data communications links that operate concurrently. Furthermore, Murayama does not teach or suggest that the first and second master switch wireless modules broadcast connection signals nor does Murayama teach or suggest that the first and second slave switch wireless modules receive the connection signals and select one of the signals for establishing a communication link. Neither does Murayama teach or suggest adding data representative of a master switch wireless communication module to a prohibited list responsive to a communication link being established as recited in claim 10.

The aforementioned deficiencies in Murayama are not remedied by any teaching of Perloff. Perloff relates to a multi-device link aggregation (MLDA) to transparently connect a pair of devices using aggregated links. Perloff provides a redundant link. A first MDLA device is connected to a second MDLA device by an MDLA internal link. Each of the interconnected first and second MDLA devices is connected to at least one common link aggregation partner (LAG) partner device by the aggregated link, respectively. Typically the first and second MDLA devices exchange data to detect devices that are common to both MDLA devices such that they are able to trick the detected devices into behaving as though the two MDLA devices are a single device. If one of the MDLA devices fails, traffic of the associated aggregated link to the failed MDLA device can be automatically forwarded by the non-failed MDLA device, thereby increasing the reliability of the system (see Abstract; paragraphs 24-25).

From the foregoing, it can be readily appreciated that Perloff does not teach or suggest first and second wireless data communications links that operate concurrently (Perloff does not teach or suggest wireless data links nor does Perloff teach or suggest that signals between the first and second devices can be routed concurrently through the plurality (e.g., first and second)

Amendment/Response dated April 9, 2007

Response to Office action dated February 6, 2007

wireless data links. Perloff is only concerned with redundancy). Furthermore, Perloff does not teach or suggest that the first and second master switch wireless modules broadcast connection signals nor does Perloff teach or suggest that the first and second slave switch wireless modules receive the connection signals and select one of the signals for establishing a communication link. Neither does Perloff teach or suggest adding data representative of a master switch wireless communication module to a prohibited list responsive to a communication link being established as recited in claim 10.

The aforementioned deficencies of Murayama and Perloff are not remedied by any teaching of Vij. Vij describes a wireless bridge that conjoins two technologies (e.g. 802.11 and Bluetooth) within a single device. Moreover, the examiner relies on Vij for teaching a wireless bridge. In other words, Vij bridges an 802.11 network with a Bluetooth (see e.g. Figs 5-7). Nowhere does Vij teach or suggest multiple wireless links between two switches or any of the other aforementioned deficiencies.

Thus, for the reasons just set forth, Murayama, Perloff, and Vij, alone or in any combination thereof, do not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1 and 10. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 7 and 15 stand rejected as being obvious in view of the combination of Murayama, Perloff, Vij and U.S. Patent No. 6,807,179 to Kanuri et al. (hereinafter Kanuri). The aforementioned deficiencies of Murayama, Perloff and Vij for claims 1 and 10 are not remedied by any teaching of Kanuri. Kanuri is directed to a network switch that includes switch ports, and switching logic for determining the output port for each received layer 2 type data packet. Moreover, the examiner relies on Kanuri to teach the port aggregation protocol is at least one of a Cisco Port Aggregation Protocol and IEEE 802.1ad port aggregation protocol. Claims 7 and 15 directly depend from claims 1 and 10 respectively and therefore contain each and every element of claims 1 and 10. Thus, claims for the reasons already set forth for claims 1 and 10, claims 7 and 15 are not obvious in view of Murayama, Perloff, Vij and/or Kanuri when taken alone or in any combination thereof. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claim 8, 9, 16 and 17 stand rejected as being obvious in view of Murayama, Perloff, Vij and U.S. Patent No. 6,901,275 to Aoyagi (*hereinafter* Aoyagi). Claim 17 directly depends from claim 10 and therefore contains each and every element of claim 10. The aforementioned

Amendment/Response dated April 9, 2007 Response to Office action dated February 6, 2007

deficiencies in Murayama, Perloff, Vii are not remedied by any teaching of Aoyagi, Aoyagi is directed to a technique for preventing communication being concentrated on one terminal, thereby avoiding an increase in power consumption. A first device is established as a master and receives battery information from slave devices. When the remaining battery power of the master falls below a threshold level, a slave unit is appointed master. Aoyagi. Aoyagi does not teach or suggest multiple wireless communication links between two devices, connection signals sent by the master switch wireless communication modules and/or the selection of connection signals by slave switch wireless communication modules to establish the multiple communication links. Nor does Aoyagi teach or suggest a prohibited list as recited in claim 10. Moreover, the examiner relies on Ayoga for disclosing means for establishing a weighting value associated with alternative data communication paths between a selected master module and at least two of the plurality of slave switch wireless modules, and means for selectively establishing communication between the selected master and selected slave in accordance with the weighting value, which does not remedy the aforementioned deficiencies. Thus, for the reasons already set forth for claim 10, claim 17 is not obvious in view of Murayama, Perloff, Vij and Aoyagi. Claims 8, 9 and 17 have been canceled. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 19, 20 and 22 stand rejected as being obvious in view of Murayama, Perloff, Vij and U.S. Patent No. 6,014,406 to Shida et al. (hereinafter Shida). Claims 19, 20 and 22 are dependent from claim 10. The aforementioned deficiencies of Murayama, Perloff, and Vij for claim 10 are not remedied by any teaching of Shida. Shida is directed to a frequency hopped communication system in which a wireless mobile station automatically becomes a base station in accordance with surrounding conditions. The examiner relies on Shida to disclose the service set identifier is an 802.11 service set identifier and that the beacon is one of an 802.11 Beacon and an 802.11 Probe Response. This does not remedy the aforementioned deficiencies of Murayama, Perloff, and Vij, thus neither Murayama, Perloff, Vij nor Shida, taken alone or in any combination thereof teach or suggest all of the claim elements of claim 10. Claims 19, 20 and 22 directly depend from claim 10 and therefore contain each and every element of claim 10. Thus, for the reason already set forth for claim 10, claims 19, 20 and 22 are not obvious in view of Murayama, Perloff, Vij and Shida, alone or in any combination thereof.

Amendment/Response dated April 9, 2007

Response to Office action dated February 6, 2007

In addition to the reasons set forth above for claim 1, new claim 24 recites that the first wireless data communication link and second wireless data communication link are isolated by spatial separation. New claim 25 recites that the first wireless data communication link and second wireless data communication link are isolated by frequency separation. Nowhere does Murayama, Perloff, Vij, Kanuri, Aoyagi and/or Shida, alone or in combination, teach or suggest these claim elements.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, withdrawal of the claim rejections is requested and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 72255/00003.

Date: 4-9-2007

Respectfully submitted,

Larry B. Donovan Registration No. 47,230

TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP 1150 Huntington Bldg.

925 Euclid Ave.

Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414 Customer No.: 23380

Tel.: (216) 696-3864 Fax: (216) 592-5009